arXiv:1702.03384v3 [math.FA] 21 Mar 2017

DYNAMICAL SAMPLING ON FINITE INDEX SETS

CARLOS CABRELLI, URSULA MOLTER, VICTORIA PATERNOSTRO,
AND FRIEDRICH PHILIPP

Abstract. We consider a normal bounded operator A acting iteratively on a finite set of vectors $\{f_i : i \in I\}$ in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The main result in this paper gives necessary and sufficient conditions in order that the collection of iterates $\{A^n f_i : i \in I, n = 0, 1, 2, ...\}$ forms a frame for the space $\mathcal{H}$. The proof uses techniques from different areas of mathematics, such as operator theory, spectral theory, harmonic analysis, and complex analysis in the unit disk. We also consider general bounded operators A and show in particular that it is necessary for the frame property that the spectrum of A^* is contained in the closed unit disk and that the eigenvalues in the open disk either fill it up completely or are discrete.

These results provide a theoretical solution for the so-called Dynamical Sampling problem where a signal f that is evolving in time through iterates of an operator A is spatially sub-sampled at different locations and times and one seeks to reconstruct the signal f from these spatial-temporal samples.

1. Introduction

Given a system of vectors $\{f_i\}_{i\in I}$ from some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and a normal operator A, we consider the collection of iterates $\mathcal{F} = \{A^n f_i : i \in I, n = 1, \dots, l_i\}$. We are interested in the special structure of this set. The relevant questions are when the set $\mathcal{F}$ is complete in $\mathcal{H}$, when it is a basis, when it is a Bessel sequence, or when it forms a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. In particular, one seeks conditions on the operator A, the vectors $\{f_i\}$ and the number of iterations l_i in order to guarantee the desired structure of the set of iterations.

These questions are in general of a very difficult nature. Their answers require the use of notions and techniques of different areas of mathematics such as operator theory, spectral theory, harmonic analysis, and complex analysis in the unit disk. The results are most of the time unexpected. Just to mention some examples, it was proved in [3] that if A is a diagonalizable operator in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, the collection $\mathcal{F}$ can never be a basis of $\mathcal{H}$. It was also shown in [3] that for these kind of operators the orbit $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of one vector $f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ is a frame for $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ if and only if the sequence of eigenvalues of A is a set of interpolation for the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ of the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ together with some boundedness condition on the vector f.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 94A20, 42C15, 30J99, 47A53.

Key words and phrases. Sampling Theory, Dynamical Sampling, Frame, Normal Operator, Semi-Fredholm, Strongly stable.

The research of the authors was partially supported by UBACyT under grants 20020130100403BA, 20020130100422BA, and 20020150200110BA, by CONICET (PIP 11220110101018), and MinCyT Argentina under grant PICT-2014-1480.

In addition to its profound mathematical relevance, this problem constitutes an instance of the so-called Dynamical Sampling problem. In Dynamical Sampling a signal f that is evolving in time through an operator A is spatially sub-sampled at different locations and times and one seeks to reconstruct the signal f from these spatial-temporal samples, thereby exploiting time evolution. (see, e.g., [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 16]).

In the following, we shall introduce the reader to the motivation, the ideas, and the details of Dynamical Sampling, describe the current state of research, and expose our contribution in this paper.

1.1. **Motivation and idea of Dynamical Sampling.** Let us assume that we are given the task of retrieving and storing information about a signal f from a space $\mathcal{H}$ of functions that vary in space in such a way that f can later be recovered from this information. The first idea is, of course, to sample (i.e., evaluate) the function f at many convenient places x_i – hoping that the knowledge on the properties of the functions in $\mathcal{H}$ suffices to recover f from the samples $f(x_i)$. However, in real-world scenarios there are typically many restrictions that one has to deal with. For example, the access to some of the required places x_i might be prohibited. Another problem is that sensors are usually very expensive so that the installation of a great number of them in order to guarantee a high-accuracy recovery becomes a crucial financial problem. The idea of Dynamical Sampling is to avoid these obstacles by taking another dimension into account: time.

Suppose that the object that is represented by f changes over time, so that f is in fact the evaluation at time $t = 0$ of a function g that depends on both space and time. In mathematical terms, $f = g(0, \cdot)$, where $g(t, x)$ is a solution of a dynamical system. In the simplest case, where this dynamical system is homogeneous and linear, the function $u(t) = g(t, \cdot)$, $t \geq 0$, maps $[0, \infty)$ to some function space $\mathcal{H}$ and satisfies $\dot{u}(t) = Bu(t)$, where B is a generator of a semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of operators. The solution of this Cauchy problem is given by $u(t) = T_t u(0) = T_t f$.

The idea of Dynamical Sampling now is – instead of sampling f at many places – to sample u coarsely in space, but at various times t. This idea was for the first time considered by Lu et al. (see [12, 16]), where the authors investigated signals obeying the heat equation. In this case, B is the Laplace operator. In the general case – when we sample uniformly in time –, the samples are of the form

$$g(nt_0, x_i) = u(nt_0)(x_i) = [T_{t_0}^n f](x_i), \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n_i,\ i \in I.$$

If $\mathcal{H}$ is in fact a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with kernel K, we have

$$g(nt_0, x_i) = \left\langle T_{t_0}^n f, K_{x_i} \right\rangle = \left\langle f, A^n K_{x_i} \right\rangle,$$

where $A := T_{t_0}^*$. Since the original task was to recover f from the retrieved information, the question now becomes: "*Is* $(A^n K_{x_i})_{n,i}$ *complete in* $\mathcal{H}$*?*". If one requires the recovery to be a stable process, the question is "*Is* $(A^n K_{x_i})_{n,i}$ *a frame for* $\mathcal{H}$*?*".

1.2. **Previous works on the topic.** Aldroubi et al. (see [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]) considered the problem from a somewhat more general point of view. The samples in their setting are of the form $\langle f, A^n f_i \rangle$, where A is a bounded linear operator in an arbitrary Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$. In this setting, where the objects are not fixed, the above questions become:

For which operators A, which sets $I, N_i \subset \mathbb{N}$, and which vectors $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i \in I$, is the system $(A^n f_i)_{i\in I,\, n\in N_i}$ complete in $\mathcal{H}$ or a frame for $\mathcal{H}$?

In [3] the problem in the finite-dimensional setting was completely solved. For example, if $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$ is diagonalizable, then $(A^n f_i)_{i\in I,\, n\in N_i}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^m$ if and only if for each eigenprojection P of A we have that $(Pf_i)_{i\in I}$ is complete in $P\mathcal{H}$. Here, $N_i = \{0, \dots, r_i - 1\}$, where r_i is the degree of the A-annihilator of f_i. If the operator A is non-diagonalizable, the above statement generalizes to a somewhat more complicated version involving the Jordan normal form of A. In the infinite-dimensional situation, the authors considered the one-vector problem (i.e., $|I| = 1$) – under the additional condition that A be diagonal (i.e., $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$, where $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is bounded and the P_j are orthogonal projections, $P_j P_k = 0$ for $j \neq k$) with multiplicity 1 (i.e., $\dim P_j\mathcal{H} = 1$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$). They show (see Theorem 3.4) that $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if the sequence $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly separated (cf. page 9) in the unit disk and both sequences $(a_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(a_j^{-1})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ are bounded, where $a_j := \|P_j f\|/\sqrt{1 - |\lambda_j|^2}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Recently, it was proved in [5] that the above assumption that A be diagonal is not a restriction in the case when A is normal and I finite. In fact, in this case to be diagonal is necessary for $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ to be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. In the case where $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is only required to form a Bessel sequence, A is not necessarily diagonal. In this case, a certain measure related to A and f has to be a so-called Carleson measure (see [15]). Instead of only considering normal operators A (as in [3] and [2]), the authors of [5] also consider general bounded operators A and prove that it is necessary for $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ to form a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ that the operator A^* be strongly stable (i.e., $(A^*)^n f \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for each $f \in \mathcal{H}$). If $A = T_{t_0}^*$ is derived from a semigroup as above, this means that the semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ has to be strongly stable.

1.3. **Our contribution.** Our contribution is two-fold. On the one hand, we generalize the above-mentioned result in the one-vector case to the multi-vector case, that is, we consider finite index sets I. In the one-vector case (i.e., $|I| = 1$), the isomorphism between $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ enables the use of Carleson's theorem on interpolation sequences to obtain the desired frame characterization. The attempt of proving a similar result for $|I| > 1$ with the same methods fails terribly because Carleson's theorem cannot be used directly. As a consequence, the problem becomes much more difficult and new techniques have to be found. Our strategy consists of a careful analysis of the Dynamical Sampling problem for normal operators in Section 3, thereby deriving some technical lemmas. They will be the key to prove our main theorem in this section (cf. Theorem 3.8). This theorem characterizes those normal operators A and vectors f_i (the index set I being finite) for which $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. As it turns out, the condition that the eigenvalue sequence $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be uniformly separated (as in the one-vector case) has to be replaced by the weaker condition that Λ be a *finite union* of uniformly separated sequences. From here, the question naturally arises, how many uniformly separated sequences are contained in Λ. An obvious first conjecture is that the answer is $|I|$, which would fit to the one-vector case. However, this is a non-trivial question and we leverage another characterization result, Theorem 3.3, for showing in Theorem 3.12 that the conjecture indeed is true: the minimal number of uniformly separated subsequences

in a partition of Λ (which we call the *index* of Λ) is bounded from above by $|I|$ – just as the dimensions $\dim P_j\mathcal{H}$. This upper bound on the index is sharp (see Remark 3.13).

On the other hand, we prove new results for the case where A is not assumed to be normal. In fact, if $A^* = T_{t_0}$ is an instance of a semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ as in the above motivation for the Dynamical Sampling setting, the operator A is bounded but not normal, in general. It is clear that in this more general case, we loose the strong instrument of the highly-developed spectral theory for normal operators, so that the problem becomes much more involved. However, we show that also for non-normal operators A and finite index sets it is necessary for $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ to be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ that the spectrum of A be contained in the closed unit disk and that its intersection with the unit circle is non-empty. We furthermore prove a characterization result (see Proposition 4.3) in which we do not assume that the index set is finite. From this characterization it follows that it is necessary for $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ to be a Bessel sequence that

$$ASA^* = S - F,$$

where S and F are the frame operators of $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ and $(f_i)_{i\in I}$, respectively. This relation lays the foundations for Theorem 4.6 which states in particular that for finite index sets I (which we shall assume from here) the eigenvalues of A^* in $\mathbb{D}$ either fill the whole open unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ or are discrete in $\mathbb{D}$ with finite multiplicities. Although the first case seems to be a rarity, we provide an example in which this case occurs and $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ (cf. Example 4.12). The system in this example is in fact an orthonormal basis and we prove that this holds in general: in order that $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ be a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$ it is necessary that each point in the open unit disk is an eigenvalue of A^*. Using this, it is shown that $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ can never be a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$ when $A^* = T_{t_0}$ is the instance of a semigroup (see Corollary 4.15).

1.4. **Outline.** The present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide the necessary background from frame theory, operator theory, spectral theory, and the theory of sequences in the open unit disk. Section 3 contains our main results concerning Dynamical Sampling on finite index sets with normal operators, including the above-mentioned characterization and the estimate on the index of the eigenvalue sequence. In Section 4, we drop the requirement that A be normal and provide our results, summarized above, for this more general setting. They show that there are some similarities to the normal situation, but also vast differences.

2. Preliminaries

First of all, let us fix the notation that we shall use throughout this paper. By $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the set of the natural numbers *including zero*. Unit circle and open unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$ are denoted by $\mathbb{T}$ and $\mathbb{D}$, respectively, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}.$$

The open ball in $\mathbb{C}$ with radius $r > 0$ and center $z \in \mathbb{C}$ will be denoted by $B_r(z)$. The p-th Hardy space on the unit disk, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, is denoted by $H^p(\mathbb{D})$. Recall that especially $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ consists of those functions that have a representation $\varphi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, where $c = (c_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, and that $\|\varphi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} = \|c\|_2$.

Throughout, $\mathcal{H}$ stands for a separable Hilbert space. By $L(\mathcal{H})$ we denote the set of all bounded operators from $\mathcal{H}$ to itself which are defined on all of $\mathcal{H}$. The kernel (i.e., the null-space) and the range (i.e., the image) of $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ are denoted by $\ker T$ and $\operatorname{ran} T$, respectively. The *spectrum* of $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ (i.e., the set of all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which $T-\lambda = T-\lambda\,\mathrm{Id}$ is not boundedly invertible) is denoted by $\sigma(T)$, the set of all eigenvalues of T (usually called the *point spectrum* of T) by $\sigma_p(T)$. The continuous spectrum of T is the set of all $\lambda \in \sigma(T) \setminus \sigma_p(T)$ for which $\operatorname{ran}(T-\lambda)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. It is denoted by $\sigma_c(T)$.

2.1. **Vector systems in Hilbert spaces.** Let $\mathcal{F} = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of vectors in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The *analysis operator* of $\mathcal{F}$ is then defined as $T : \mathcal{H} \supset D(T) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$,

$$Tf := (\langle f, f_n\rangle)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}, \qquad f \in D(T),$$

where the domain $D(T)$ of T is given by

$$D(T) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{H} : (\langle f, f_n\rangle)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \right\}.$$

It is well known (and straightforward to prove) that T is always a closed operator (i.e., its graph is closed in $\mathcal{H}\oplus\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$). Hence, by the closed graph theorem, we have $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $D(T) = \mathcal{H}$. In this case, the sequence $\mathcal{F}$ is called a *Bessel sequence*. That is, $\mathcal{F}$ is a Bessel sequence if and only if there exists some $B > 0$ (a so-called *Bessel bound* of $\mathcal{F}$) such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle f, f_n\rangle|^2 \;\le\; B\|f\|^2, \qquad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Let $\mathcal{F} = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a Bessel sequence. The adjoint T^* of T is then called the *synthesis operator* of $\mathcal{F}$. It can be represented by

$$T^*c = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n f_n, \qquad c = (c_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N}).$$

The operator $S := T^*T$ is called the *frame operator* of $\mathcal{F}$. We have

$$Sf = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle f, f_n\rangle f_n, \qquad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

It is evident that S is a bounded non-negative selfadjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}$. The Bessel sequence $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be a *frame* for $\mathcal{H}$ if its frame operator S is boundedly invertible, i.e., there exist $A, B > 0$ such that $A\|f\|^2 \le \langle Sf, f\rangle \le B\|f\|^2$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$. Equivalently,

$$A\|f\|^2 \;\le\; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle f, f_n\rangle|^2 \;\le\; B\|f\|^2, \qquad f \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{2.1}$$

More generally, if (2.1) holds for all $f \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is called a *frame sequence*. The bounds A and B are called (lower and upper, respectively) *frame bounds* of $\mathcal{F}$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, the frame relation (2.1) immediately yields that $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is complete in $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{H}$.

Another object associated with a vector sequence $\mathcal{F} = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is its *Gram matrix* $G = (\langle f_n, f_m\rangle)_{n,m\in\mathbb{N}}$ which is obviously hermitian. A Bessel sequence $\mathcal{F} = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{H}$

is called a *Riesz sequence* if there exist $A, B > 0$ such that $A\|c\|_2^2 \leq \|T^*c\|^2 \leq B\|c\|_2^2$ for each $c \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. A *Riesz basis* of $\mathcal{H}$ is a complete Riesz sequence.

In this paper we shall make use of the following collection of basic statements. Proofs of them can be found in [6].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$. Then the following statements hold.*

(i) *$\mathcal{F}$ is a Bessel sequence if and only if G defines an operator in $L(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}))$.*
(ii) *$\mathcal{F}$ is a frame sequence if and only if G defines an operator in $L(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}))$ with closed range.*
(iii) *The Bessel sequence $\mathcal{F}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if T^* is surjective.*
(iv) *The Bessel sequence $\mathcal{F}$ is a Riesz sequence if and only if T is surjective.*

2.2. **Normal and diagonal operators.** Recall that an operator $A \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *normal* if $A^*A = AA^*$. It is well known (see, e.g., [7]) that a normal operator induces a *spectral measure* E which maps Borel sets in $\mathbb{C}$ to orthogonal projections on $\mathcal{H}$, thereby satisfying the following condition:

$$E(\Delta)f = \sum_{j\in J} E(\Delta_j)f, \qquad f \in \mathcal{H},$$

where J is at most countable, the Δ_j are mutually disjoint, and $\Delta = \bigcup_{j\in J} \Delta_j$. A spectral measure allows integration of measurable functions ϕ on $\sigma(A)$. The result is a (possibly unbounded) normal operator $\phi(A) = \int \phi\, dE$. Its domain is given by $D(\phi(A)) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : \phi \in L^2(d\mu_f)\}$, where $\mu_f = \|E(\cdot)f\|^2$. We have $A = \int z\, dE$ and (cf. [7, Theorem X.4.7])

$$\|\phi(A)f\|^2 = \int |\phi|^2\, d\mu_f, \quad f \in D(\phi(A)). \tag{2.2}$$

In the sequel, we will often be dealing with diagonal operators – a special class of normal operators – which we define as follows.

Definition 2.2. A *diagonal operator* in $\mathcal{H}$ is of the form $A = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j P_j$ (the series converging in the strong operator topology), where J is a finite or countable index set, $(\lambda_j)_{j\in J} \subset \mathbb{C}$ a bounded sequence of scalars, and $(P_j)_{j\in J}$ a sequence of orthogonal projections with $P_jP_k = 0$ for $j \neq k$. The series $\sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j P_j$ is called a *normal form* of A if $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for $j \neq k$ and $\sum_{j\in J} P_j = \mathrm{Id}$. The *multiplicity* of a diagonal operator A is defined by

$$\mathrm{mult}(A) := \max\{\dim P_j\mathcal{H} : j \in J\},$$

where $(P_j)_{j\in J}$ is the sequence of orthogonal projections in a normal form of A. If the maximum should not exist, we set $\mathrm{mult}(A) := \infty$ and say that A has infinite multiplicity.

The normal form of a diagonal operator is obviously unique up to permutations of J. Moreover, it is clear that the λ_j in the normal form of A are the distinct eigenvalues of A and that P_j projects onto the eigenspace $\ker(A - \lambda_j)$. Note that every diagonal operator is bounded and normal.

Lemma 2.3. *A normal operator $A \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is a diagonal operator if and only if*

$$E(\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_p(A)) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $A = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j P_j$ be a diagonal operator in normal form. Then it is clear that $\sigma_p(A) = \{\lambda_j : j \in J\}$. Moreover, the spectral measure of A is given by $E = \sum_{j\in J} \delta_{\lambda_j} P_j$ because $\int z\, d(\sum_{j\in J} \delta_{\lambda_j} P_j) = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j P_j = A$. Thus, $E(\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_p(A)) = 0$. For the converse, we note that since $\mathcal{H}$ is separable and the operator A is normal, the set of its distinct eigenvalues is countable. Thus, $\sigma_p(A) = \{\lambda_j : j \in J\}$, where $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for $j \neq k$. If $E(\sigma(A) \setminus \sigma_p(A)) = 0$, then for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$Af = \int_{\sigma(A)} z\, dEf = \int_{\sigma_p(A)} z\, dEf = \sum_{j\in J} \int_{\{\lambda_j\}} z\, dEf = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j E(\{\lambda_j\})f,$$

which shows that A is a diagonal operator. □

As it was seen in the proof of Lemma 2.3, if $A = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j P_j$ is the normal form of the diagonal operator A, the spectral measure E of A is given by

$$E = \sum_{j\in J} \delta_{\lambda_j} P_j.$$

Hence, for any vector $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\mu_h = \sum_{j\in J} \|P_j h\|^2 \delta_{\lambda_j}. \tag{2.3}$$

2.3. **Semi-Fredholm operators.** An operator $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *upper semi-Fredholm*, if $\ker T$ is finite-dimensional and $\operatorname{ran} T$ is closed. The operator T is called *lower semi-Fredholm*, if $\operatorname{codim} \operatorname{ran} T < \infty$ (in this case, the range of T is automatically closed). T is called *semi-Fredholm* if it is upper or lower semi-Fredholm and *Fredholm* if it is both upper and lower semi-Fredholm. In all cases, one defines the *nullity* and *deficiency* of T by

$$\operatorname{nul}(T) := \dim \ker T \qquad \text{and} \qquad \operatorname{def}(T) := \operatorname{codim} \operatorname{ran} T.$$

The *index* of T is defined by

$$\operatorname{ind}(T) := \operatorname{nul}(T) - \operatorname{def}(T).$$

This value might be a positive or negative integer or $\pm\infty$. It is, moreover, easily seen that T is upper semi-Fredholm if and only if T^* is lower semi-Fredholm. We have $\operatorname{def}(T^*) = \operatorname{nul}(T)$ and $\operatorname{nul}(T^*) = \operatorname{def}(T)$ and thus $\operatorname{ind}(T^*) = -\operatorname{ind}(T)$. The next theorem shows that the semi-Fredholm property of operators is stable under compact perturbations.

Theorem 2.4 ([11, Theorem IV.5.26])**.** *If $K \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is compact and $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is upper (lower) semi-Fredholm, then $T + K$ is upper (lower, respectively) semi-Fredholm with* $\operatorname{ind}(T + K) = \operatorname{ind}(T)$.

For a proof of the following lemma we refer the reader to [13, Theorems III.16.5, III.16.6, and III.16.12].

Lemma 2.5. *Let $S, T \in L(\mathcal{H})$. Then the following statements hold.*

(i) *If ST is upper semi-Fredholm, then so is T.*

(ii) *If S and T are upper semi-Fredholm, then so is ST and*

$$\operatorname{ind}(ST) = \operatorname{ind}(S) + \operatorname{ind}(T). \tag{2.4}$$

While Theorem 2.4 deals with compact perturbations, the next theorem (also known as the (extended) *punctured neighborhood theorem* (see [10, Theorems 4.1 and 4.2])) is concerned with perturbations of the type $\lambda \operatorname{Id}$, where $|\lambda|$ is small.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ be upper semi-Fredholm and put*

$$k := \dim\left[\ker T/(\ker T \cap R_\infty(T))\right],$$

where $R_\infty(T) := \bigcap_{n=0}^\infty \operatorname{ran}(T^n)$. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $0 < |\lambda| < \varepsilon$ the following statements hold.

(i) *$T - \lambda$ is upper semi-Fredholm.*
(ii) $\operatorname{ind}(T-\lambda) = \operatorname{ind}(T)$.
(iii) $\operatorname{nul}(T-\lambda) = \operatorname{nul}(T) - k$.
(iv) $\operatorname{def}(T-\lambda) = \operatorname{def}(T) - k$.

2.4. **Sequences in the unit disk and the pseudo-hyperbolic metric.** A sequence $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the open unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ is called *interpolating* for $H^p(\mathbb{D})$, $1 \le p < \infty$, if for each sequence $(d_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\sum_{j=0}^\infty |d_j|^p(1-|\lambda_j|^2) < \infty$ there exists some $\varphi \in H^p(\mathbb{D})$ such that $\varphi(\lambda_j) = d_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Λ is called *interpolating* for $H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$, if for each sequence $(d_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^\infty$ there exists some $\varphi \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})$ such that $\varphi(\lambda_j) = d_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the linear *evaluation operator*

$$T_\Lambda : H^2(\mathbb{D}) \supset D(T_\Lambda) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{N}), \qquad T_\Lambda\varphi := (\varepsilon_j\varphi(\lambda_j))_{j\in\mathbb{N}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\varepsilon_j := \sqrt{1-|\lambda_j|^2}$ and

$$D(T_\Lambda) = \left\{\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D}) : (\varepsilon_j\varphi(\lambda_j))_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})\right\}.$$

Note that $\varepsilon_j\varphi(\lambda_j) = \langle \varphi, K_{\lambda_j}\rangle_{H^2(\mathbb{D})}$, where

$$K_\lambda(z) = \sqrt{1-|\lambda|^2}\sum_{n=0}^\infty \overline{\lambda}^n z^n = \frac{\sqrt{1-|\lambda|^2}}{1-\overline{\lambda}z}, \qquad \lambda, z \in \mathbb{D}, \tag{2.6}$$

is the normalized reproducing kernel of $H^2(\mathbb{D})$. Hence, the operator T_Λ is the analysis operator corresponding to the sequence $(K_{\lambda_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$. And as every analysis operator is closed on its natural domain, it follows from the closed graph theorem that T_Λ is a bounded operator from $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ to $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ if and only if $D(T_\Lambda) = H^2(\mathbb{D})$.

Lemma 2.7. *If $\mathbb{1} \in D(T_\Lambda)$, then $\mathrm{id}^n \in D(T_\Lambda)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, T_Λ is densely defined. If, in addition, $\lambda_i \ne \lambda_j$ for $i \ne j$, then $\operatorname{ran} T_\Lambda$ is dense in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.*

Proof. First, $\mathbb{1} \in D(T_\Lambda)$ means that Λ is a Blaschke sequence, i.e., $(\varepsilon_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Thus, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\sum_{j=0}^\infty \varepsilon_j^2|\lambda_j|^{2n} \le \sum_{j=0}^\infty \varepsilon_j^2 < \infty$. That is, $\mathrm{id}^n \in D(T_\Lambda)$. If $\lambda_i \ne \lambda_j$ for $i \ne j$, for fixed $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let B_i be the Blaschke product of $(\lambda_j)_{j\ne i}$, i.e.,

$$B_i(z) = z^k \prod_{j\ne i} \frac{\lambda_j - z}{1-\overline{\lambda}_j z}\frac{|\lambda_j|}{\lambda_j},$$

where $k \in \{0,1\}$ and $k = 0$ iff $\lambda_j \ne 0$ for all $j \ne i$. Set $f_i := (\varepsilon_i B_i(\lambda_i))^{-1}B_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $f_i \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D}) \subset H^2(\mathbb{D})$ (see, e.g., [17, Theorem 15.21]). Moreover, $f_i \in D(T_\Lambda)$ and $T_\Lambda f_i$ is the i-th standard basis vector of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Hence, $\operatorname{ran} T_\Lambda$ is dense in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. □

Recall that the *pseudo-hyperbolic metric* ϱ on the open unit disk is defined by

$$\varrho(z,w) := \left|\frac{z-w}{1-z\overline{w}}\right|, \quad z,w \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Since

$$|1-z\overline{w}|^2 = |z-w|^2 + (1-|z|^2)(1-|w|^2), \tag{2.7}$$

we always have $\varrho(z,w) < 1$. It is well known that ϱ is indeed a metric on $\mathbb{D}$.

Lemma 2.8. *For $z \in \mathbb{D}$ put $s_z = \sqrt{1-|z|^2}$. Then for $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$ the following relation holds:*

$$\|K_z - K_w\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} = (2 - s_z s_w)\varrho(z,w)^2 - \left(1-\varrho(z,w)^2\right)\frac{(s_z - s_w)^2}{s_z s_w}.$$

In particular,

$$\|K_z - K_w\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} \le \sqrt{2}\,\varrho(z,w).$$

Proof. Using $1-\varrho(z,w)^2 = s_z^2 s_w^2/|1-\overline{z}w|^2$ (see (2.7)), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|K_z - K_w\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} &= 2 - 2\,\mathrm{Re}\langle K_z, K_w\rangle = 2 - 2\,\mathrm{Re}\,\frac{s_z s_w}{1-\overline{z}w} \\
&= 2 - 2\frac{s_z s_w}{|1-\overline{z}w|^2}(1 - \mathrm{Re}(\overline{z}w)) \\
&= 2 - \frac{s_z s_w}{|1-\overline{z}w|^2}\left(2 - 2\,\mathrm{Re}(\overline{z}w) - 2s_z s_w\right) - 2\left(1-\varrho(z,w)^2\right) \\
&= 2\varrho(z,w)^2 - \frac{s_z s_w}{|1-\overline{z}w|^2}\left(2 + |z-w|^2 - |z|^2 - |w|^2 - 2s_z s_w\right) \\
&= 2\varrho(z,w)^2 - \frac{s_z s_w}{|1-\overline{z}w|^2}\left((s_z - s_w)^2 + |z-w|^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. □

A sequence $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the open unit disk is called *separated* if

$$\inf_{j\neq k} \varrho(\lambda_j, \lambda_k) > 0.$$

The sequence Λ is called *uniformly separated* if

$$\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \prod_{j\neq k} \varrho(\lambda_j, \lambda_k) > 0.$$

The following theorem is due to Shapiro and Shields [18].

Theorem 2.9. *Let $1 \le p \le \infty$. For a sequence $\Lambda = (\lambda_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}$ the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *Λ is an interpolating sequence for $H^p(\mathbb{D})$.*
(ii) *The evaluation operator T_Λ is defined on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and is onto.*
(iii) *The sequence $(K_{\lambda_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Riesz sequence in $H^2(\mathbb{D})$.*
(iv) *Λ is uniformly separated.*

Note that the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 2.9 simply follows from the fact that T_Λ is the analysis operator of the sequence $(K_{\lambda_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$. The following two theorems can be found in [9].

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

(i) *Λ is a finite union of uniformly separated sequences.*
(ii) *$D(T_\Lambda) = H^2(\mathbb{D})$.*

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *Λ is uniformly separated.*
(ii) *Λ is separated and $D(T_\Lambda) = H^2(\mathbb{D})$.*

Note that Theorem 2.11 is not formulated as a theorem in [9], but is hidden in the proof of the implication (iii)⇒(i) of the main theorem. It immediately implies the next corollary.

Corollary 2.12. *Let $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{D}$ such that $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for $j \neq k$. If $(\lambda_j)_{j\geq n}$ is uniformly separated, then also $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly separated.*

Definition 2.13. Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a finite union of separated sequences. The *index* of Λ is then defined by

$$\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda) = \min\left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} J_k,\ (\lambda_j)_{j\in J_k} \text{ is separated for each } k = 1, \dots, n \right\}.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $r > 0$ by $\mathbb{B}_r(z)$ we denote the pseudo-hyperbolic ball (ϱ-ball) in $\mathbb{D}$ of radius r and center z, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(z) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{D} : \varrho(\lambda, z) < r\}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{B}_r(z) = B_{r'}(z')$ with $r' < r$ and $z' = tz$, where $t < 1$.

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{D}$. For $r \in (0,1)$ and $z \in \mathbb{D}$ define*

$$J(r,z) := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_j \in \mathbb{B}_r(z)\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad m_r := \sup_{z\in\mathbb{D}} |J(r,z)|,$$

and assume $m_{r_0} < \infty$ for some $r_0 \in (0,1)$. Then Λ is a finite union of m_{r_0} separated sequences (or less) and

$$\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda) = \inf\{m_r : r \in (0, r_0]\}. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. For $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ define $\Lambda_J := (\lambda_j)_{j\in J}$ and set $M := m_{r_0}$. We will define subsets $J_1, \dots, J_m$, $m \leq M$, recursively such that $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{m} J_k$ and each Λ_{J_k} is separated. For the definition of J_1, set $j_0 := 0$ and once $j_0, \dots, j_s$ are chosen, we pick

$$j_{s+1} := \min\left\{ j > j_s : \lambda_j \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \mathbb{B}_r(\lambda_{j_i}) \right\}.$$

Note that j_{s+1} is well defined due to the assumption that $M < \infty$. In other words, $\lambda_{j_{s+1}}$ is the first element of the sequence Λ that does not belong to any of the balls of radius r around the previously chosen elements. Put $J_1 := \{j_s : s \in \mathbb{N}\}$. It is clear that Λ_{J_1} is separated (by r) and that all the λ_j that have not been chosen due to this process belong to some $\mathbb{B}_r(\lambda_{j_s})$.

If $\mathbb{N} \setminus J_1$ is finite, we are finished. If not, proceed as before with $\mathbb{N} \setminus J_1$ instead of $\mathbb{N}$ to find an infinite set $J_2 \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus J_1$ such that Λ_{J_2} is separated (by r). Continuing in this

way, the process either terminates after $m < M-1$ steps (in which case we are done) or we obtain $M-1$ separated sequences $\Lambda_{J_1}, \dots, \Lambda_{J_{M-1}}$. In this case, put

$$J_M := \mathbb{N} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{M-1} J_k.$$

Let us prove that Λ_{J_M} is separated. For this, let $j \in J_M$ be arbitrary. Then, as a result of the construction process, $\lambda_j \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{M-1} \mathbb{B}_r(\lambda_{i_k})$, where $i_k \in J_k$, $k = 1, \dots, M-1$. Thus, we have that $j, i_1, \dots, i_{M-1} \in J(r, \lambda_j)$ such that $J(r, \lambda_j) = \{j, i_1, \dots, i_{M-1}\}$. Therefore, $\varrho(\lambda_j, \lambda_l) \geq r$ for all $l \in J_M$, $l \neq j$. Hence, Λ_{J_M} is indeed separated.

It remains to prove the relation (2.8). For this, put $m_0 := \inf\{m_r : r \in (0, r_0]\}$. It is clear that $m_0 = m_{r_1}$ for some $r_1 \leq r_0$ (note that $r \mapsto m_r$ is non-decreasing) and that, therefore, $n := \operatorname{ind}(\Lambda) \leq m_0$. There exist $J_1, \dots, J_n \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} J_k$ such that Λ_{J_k} is separated for each $k = 1, \dots, n$. Without loss of generality, let each Λ_{J_k} be separated by r_1. From $m_0 = m_{r_1/2}$ we conclude that there exists some $z \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $|J(r_1/2, z)| = m_0$. Suppose that $n < m_0$. Then there exists some J_k that contains at least two of the m_0 elements of $J(r_1/2, z)$, say, j_1 and j_2. But then $\varrho(\lambda_{j_1}, \lambda_{j_2}) \leq \varrho(\lambda_{j_1}, z) + \varrho(z, \lambda_{j_2}) < r_1$, contradicting the fact that Λ_{J_k} is separated by r_1. □

3. Dynamical Sampling with normal operators

We will now start investigating the sequences of the form $(A^n f_i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I}$ where A is a bounded normal operator in $\mathcal{H}$, I an at most countable index set, and $(f_i)_{i \in I} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Throughout, we set

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(A, (f_i)_{i \in I}) := (A^n f_i)_{n \in \mathbb{N}, i \in I}.$$

The spectral measure of A will be denoted by E.

The fact that condition (i) in the next theorem is necessary for $\mathcal{A}$ to be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ has already been proved in [5]. Since in [5] it was not assumed that A is normal, this result also plays a certain role in the next section, where we consider non-normal operators in the Dynamical Sampling setting.

Theorem 3.1. *The following two conditions are equivalent to each other and necessary for $\mathcal{A}$ to be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$.*

(i) $(A^*)^n f \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$ *for any* $f \in \mathcal{H}$.
(ii) $\sigma(A) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ *and* $E(\mathbb{T}) = 0$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ with lower frame bound $\alpha > 0$. Then for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\alpha \|(A^*)^m f\|^2 \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i \in I} |\langle f, A^{n+m} f_i \rangle|^2 = \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \sum_{i \in I} |\langle f, A^n f_i \rangle|^2. \tag{3.1}$$

The latter series converges for $m = 0$ since $\mathcal{A}$ is a Bessel sequence. Hence, $(A^*)^m f \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Note that this is equivalent to $A^n f \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ since A is normal.

(i)⇒(ii). If $(A^*)^n f \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for each $f \in \mathcal{H}$, let $f \in E(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D})\mathcal{H}$. If we define the measure $\mu_f := \|E(\cdot)f\|^2$ and use (2.2), we obtain

$$\|A^n f\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}} |z|^{2n}\, d\mu_f \;\geq\; \mu_f(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}) = \|f\|^2.$$

Hence, $E(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}) = 0$ which is clearly equivalent to (ii).

(ii)⇒(i). Let $E(\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}) = 0$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we have $\|A^n f\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{D}} |z|^{2n}\, d\mu_f$. Since $\mathbb{1} \in L^1(\mu_f)$, we conclude from Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that $A^n f \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. □

The next lemma is a variant of a statement in [2]. The "in particular"-part was proved in [5]. For $r > 0$ we define $\mathbb{D}_r = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < r\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ with lower frame bound $\alpha > 0$. If $M_r := \sum_{i\in I} \|E(\mathbb{D}_r)f_i\|^2 < \infty$ for some $r \in (0,1)$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest integer such that $r^{2m} M_r < \alpha(1 - r^2)$, then*

$$E(\mathbb{D}_r)\mathcal{H} = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{A^n E(\mathbb{D}_r) f_i : 0 \leq n \leq m-1,\, i \in I\}.$$

In particular, if I is a finite set, then for any $r \in (0,1)$ we have that $M_r < \infty$ and the space $E(\mathbb{D}_r)\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional.

Proof. Put $f_i(r) := E(\mathbb{D}_r)f_i$, $i \in I$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be as in the lemma and let $g \in E(\mathbb{D}_r)\mathcal{H}$ such that $\langle g, A^n f_i(r)\rangle = 0$ for all $0 \leq n \leq m-1$ and all $i \in I$. Then from

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\|g\|^2 &\leq \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle g, A^n f_i(r)\rangle|^2 = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} |\langle g, A^n f_i(r)\rangle|^2 \\
&\leq \|g\|^2 \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \|A^n f_i(r)\|^2 = \|g\|^2 \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{D}_r} |z|^{2n} d\mu_{f_i}(z) \\
&\leq \|g\|^2 \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty} r^{2n}\|f_i(r)\|^2 = \frac{r^{2m}}{1-r^2} M_r \|g\|^2
\end{aligned}$$

and the choice of m we obtain $g = 0$. □

For the rest of this section we shall restrict ourselves to diagonal operators A. The reason for this is that the operator A is necessarily diagonal if $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ and I is finite (see Theorem 3.8).

For an at most countable index set I we define $H^2_I := \bigoplus_{i\in I} H^2(\mathbb{D})$. This is the space of tuples $\phi = (\varphi_i)_{i\in I}$, where $\varphi_i \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ for each $i \in I$, such that $\sum_{i\in I} \|\varphi_i\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{D})} < \infty$. One defines $\|\phi\|_{H^2_I} := (\sum_{i\in I} \|\varphi_i\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{D})})^{1/2}$.

In addition, we shall write the tensor product of a sequence $\vec{y} = (y_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and a function $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ as $\vec{y}\varphi$ (i.e., $(\vec{y}\varphi)(z) = (y_i\varphi(z))_{i\in I}$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$). The result is an element of H^2_I if and only if $\vec{y} \in \ell^2(I)$. In this case,

$$\|\vec{y}\varphi\|_{H^2_I} = \|\vec{y}\|_2 \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})}. \tag{3.2}$$

For a sequence $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}$ in the open unit disk we agree to write

$$\varepsilon_j := \sqrt{1-|\lambda_j|^2}, \qquad j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.3}$$

Although ε_j depends on Λ, it will always be clear which Λ it refers to.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$ be a diagonal operator in normal form with $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{D}$ and let $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i \in I$. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we put $n_j := \dim P_j\mathcal{H}$ (where possibly $n_j = \infty$) and $L_j := \{1, \dots, n_j\}$. Moreover, let $(e_{jl})_{l=1}^{n_j}$ be an orthonormal basis of $P_j\mathcal{H}$ and for $l \in L_j$ define $\vec{y}_{jl} := \varepsilon_j^{-1}(\langle e_{jl}, f_i\rangle)_{i\in I}$ as well as $\phi_{jl} := \vec{y}_{jl}K_{\lambda_j}$. Then the following statements hold.*

(i) *$\mathcal{A}$ is a Bessel sequence in $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $\vec{y}_{jl} \in \ell^2(I)$ (i.e., $\phi_{jl} \in H_I^2$) for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $l \in L_j$ and $\Phi = (\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N}, l\in L_j}$ is a Bessel sequence in H_I^2. In this case, the Bessel bounds of $\mathcal{A}$ and Φ coincide.*

(ii) *$\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $\vec{y}_{jl} \in \ell^2(I)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $l \in L_j$ and $\Phi = (\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N}, l\in L_j}$ is a Riesz sequence in H_I^2. In this case, the frame bounds of $\mathcal{A}$ coincide with the Riesz bounds of Φ.*

Proof. In the following we will often make use of the unitary operator $U : \ell^2(I\times\mathbb{N}) \to H_I^2$, defined by $Ux = (\varphi_i)_{i\in I}$, where $\varphi_i(z) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} x_{in}z^n$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a Bessel sequence in $\mathcal{H}$ with Bessel bound $\beta > 0$. Then for $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we have that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle|^2 \;\le\; \beta\|h\|_2^2.$$

Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in L_j$. Since for $h = e_{jl}$ we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i\in I} |\lambda_j|^{2n}|\langle e_{jl}, f_i\rangle|^2 = \sum_{i\in I} \frac{|\langle e_{jl}, f_i\rangle|^2}{1-|\lambda_j|^2},$$

it follows that $\sum_{i\in I} \varepsilon_j^{-2}|\langle e_{jl}, f_i\rangle|^2 \le \beta$, i.e., $\vec{y}_{jl} \in \ell^2(I)$. Let $\psi = (\psi_i)_{i\in I} \in H_I^2$ and put $x := U^{-1}\psi \in \ell^2(I\times\mathbb{N})$. Denote the synthesis operator of $\mathcal{A}$ by T. Then for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in L_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Tx, e_{jl}\rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x_{in}A^n f_i, e_{jl}\right\rangle = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x_{in}\lambda_j^n\langle f_i, e_{jl}\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i\in I} \psi_i(\lambda_j)\langle f_i, e_{jl}\rangle = \sum_{i\in I} \frac{\langle f_i, e_{jl}\rangle}{\varepsilon_j}\left\langle \psi_i, K_{\lambda_j}\right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{i\in I}\left\langle \psi_i, \frac{\langle e_{jl}, f_i\rangle}{\varepsilon_j}K_{\lambda_j}\right\rangle = \langle \psi, \phi_{jl}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{l=1}^{n_j} |\langle \psi, \phi_{jl}\rangle|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{l=1}^{n_j} |\langle Tx, e_{jl}\rangle|^2 = \|Tx\|^2$, which implies that the sequence $(\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N}, l\in L_j}$ is a Bessel sequence in H_I^2. Let C denote its analysis operator. Then the above relation shows that $T = CU$. In particular, the Bessel bounds of both sequences coincide. Moreover, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, then $C = TU^*$ is onto, meaning that

$(\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N},\, l\in L_j}$ is indeed a Riesz sequence and that its lower Riesz bound coincides with the lower frame bound of $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$.

Assume conversely that $\vec{y}_{jl} \in \ell^2(I)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l \in L_j$ and that $(\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N},\, l\in L_j}$ is a Bessel sequence in H_I^2 with Bessel bound $\beta > 0$. If $x \in \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$ with only finitely many non-zero entries and $\psi = Ux$, then $\langle Tx, e_{jl}\rangle = \langle \psi, \phi_{jl}\rangle$, that is, $\|Tx\|^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{l=1}^{n_j} |\langle \psi, \phi_{jl}\rangle|^2 \le \beta\|\psi\|^2 = \beta\|x\|^2$. Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is a Bessel sequence. If, in addition, $(\phi_{jl})_{j\in\mathbb{N},\, l\in L_j}$ is a Riesz sequence, then $T = CU$ is onto, which means that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. □

3.1. **Singleton index sets.** If the index set I only contains one element, the system $\mathcal{A}$ has the form $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, where $f \in \mathcal{H}$. The next theorem has been proved in [3, Theorem 3.14]. We would like to mention that the operator in [3, Theorem 3.14] was actually assumed to be selfadjoint. However, the proof goes through in the same way with a normal operator.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$ be a diagonal operator in normal form and $f \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if the following statements hold:*

(i) *$(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly separated sequence in $\mathbb{D}$.*
(ii) *$\dim P_j\mathcal{H} = 1$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*
(iii) *There exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha \le \frac{\|P_j f\|^2}{1 - |\lambda_j|^2} \le \beta \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

When comparing the sequences $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $((A^*)^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ it might be surprising at first glance that the following proposition holds.

Proposition 3.5. *Let A be a bounded normal operator on $\mathcal{H}$. For $f \in \mathcal{H}$ the following statements hold.*

(i) *$(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Bessel sequence if and only if $((A^*)^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Bessel sequence.*
(ii) *$(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame sequence if and only if $((A^*)^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame sequence.*
(iii) *$(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if $((A^*)^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Let G_A and G_{A^*} denote the Gram matrices of $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $((A^*)^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, respectively. Moreover, denote the (n, m)-th entry of the matrix G_A (G_{A^*}) by $a_{nm}(A)$ ($a_{nm}(A^*)$, respectively). Then, using the normality of A gives

$$a_{nm}(A^*) = \langle (A^*)^n f, (A^*)^m f\rangle = \langle A^m f, A^n f\rangle = \overline{a_{nm}(A)}.$$

From this, it almost immediately follows that G_A defines a bounded operator if and only if G_{A^*} does and that $\operatorname{ran} G_A$ is closed if and only if $\operatorname{ran} G_{A^*}$ is closed. Thus, (i) and (ii) are proved (cf. Theorem 2.1). The claim (iii) follows from Theorem 3.4 if A is a diagonal operator. However, the necessity of A being a diagonal operator for $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to be a frame is a consequence of [5] (see also Theorem 3.8). □

In the next lemma we formulate the characterization theorems from [15] for the case of a diagonal operator.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$ be a diagonal operator in normal form and $f \in \mathcal{H}$. Put $J := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : P_j f \neq 0\}$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *The sequence $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Bessel sequence in $\mathcal{H}$.*

(ii) *$\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ for all $j \in J$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j\in J} c_j \lambda_j^n \|P_j f\|^2 \right|^2 \leq C\|c\|^2_{\ell^2_w(J)} \qquad \text{for all } c \in \ell^2_w(J),$$

where $\ell^2_w(J)$ is the weighted ℓ^2-space over J with $w = (\|P_j f\|^2)_{j\in J}$.

(iii) *$\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ for all $j \in J$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{j\in J} |\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2 \, \|P_j f\|^2 \leq C\|\varphi\|_2^2 \qquad \text{for all } \varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D}).$$

(iv) *$\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ for all $j \in J$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $r > 0$ and all $z \in \mathbb{T}$ we have*

$$\sum_{j\in J\,:\,\lambda_j \in B_r(z)} \|P_j f\|^2 \leq Cr.$$

(v) *$\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ for all $j \in J$ and there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{j\in J} \frac{\|P_j f\|^2}{|1 - \overline{z}\lambda_j|^2} \leq \frac{C}{1 - |z|^2} \qquad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Proof. Since A is a diagonal operator, we have that $\mu_f = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \delta_{\lambda_j} \|P_j f\|^2$ (see (2.3)). Assume that (i) holds. Then $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_f) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\mu_f|\mathbb{T}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the arc length measure on $\mathbb{T}$ (see [15]). Therefore, we have $P_j f = 0$ if $\lambda_j \notin \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. But this also holds for $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{T}$ due to the absolute continuity of $\mu_f|\mathbb{T}$. Summarizing, we have $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ for all $j \in J$. Since the latter is necessary for all conditions (i)–(v), we shall assume it for the rest of this proof.

We will use the various characterizations for $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ to be a Bessel sequence from [15], where it is proved that (i) is equivalent to each of the following conditions:

(ii') The sequence $(\mathrm{id}^n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Bessel sequence in $L^2(\mu_f)$.

(iii') $H^2(\mathbb{D}) \subset L^2(\mu_f)$ and this embedding is continuous.

(iv') $\mu_f|\mathbb{D}$ is a Carleson measure, that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $r > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{T}$ we have $\mu_f(B_r(z)) \leq Cr$.

(v') $\sup_{z\in\mathbb{D}} \int_{\mathbb{D}} \frac{1-|z|^2}{|1-\overline{z}\lambda|^2} \, d\mu_f(\lambda) < \infty$.

In what follows, we shall show that in the given situation (x') is equivalent to (x), where $\mathrm{x} \in \{\mathrm{ii}, \mathrm{iii}, \mathrm{iv}, \mathrm{v}\}$. In fact, (iv')⇔(iv) is obvious and the equivalences (iii')⇔(iii) and (v')⇔(v) immediately follow from

$$\int |\varphi|^2 \, d\mu_f = \sum_{j\in J} |\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2 \|P_j f\|^2, \qquad \varphi \in L^2(\mu_f). \tag{3.4}$$

It remains to prove (ii')⇔(ii). As a consequence of (3.4),the mapping $\Phi : L^2(\mu_f) \to \ell^2_w(J)$, defined by

$$\Phi\varphi := (\varphi(\lambda_j))_{j\in J}, \quad \varphi \in L^2(\mu_f),$$

is an isometric isomorphism. Now, condition (ii') holds if and only if there exists some $C > 0$ such that for every $\varphi \in L^2(\mu_f)$ we have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle \varphi, \mathrm{id}^n \rangle|^2 \le C\|\varphi\|_2^2$. Equivalently, for every $c \in \ell^2_w(J)$ we have $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle c, \Phi\, \mathrm{id}^n \rangle|^2 \le C\|c\|^2_{\ell^2_w(J)}$. But this is (ii). □

Remark 3.7. It follows from [15] that the constant C in (ii) and (iii) can be chosen to be equal to the Bessel bound of $(A^n f)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

3.2. **Finite index sets.** In this subsection we present our main results concerning Dynamical Sampling with normal operators on finite index sets. We will start right off with the main theorem. To formulate it, for a sequence Λ in $\mathbb{D}$ we define the operator

$$T_{\Lambda,I} := \bigoplus_{i\in I} T_\Lambda,$$

where T_Λ is the evaluation operator from (2.5). That is, $T_{\Lambda,I}$ is a linear operator mapping from $D(T_{\Lambda,I}) = D(T_\Lambda)^{|I|} \subset H^2_I$ (here, $H^2_I = (H^2(\mathbb{D}))^{|I|}$) to $(\ell^2(\mathbb{N}))^{|I|} = \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$. For a Bessel sequence E in $\mathcal{H}$ we let C_E denote the analysis operator of E.

Theorem 3.8. *If $|I|$ is finite, then the system $\mathcal{A} = (A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *$A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$ is a diagonal operator (in normal form) having multiplicity $\mathrm{mult}(A) \le |I|$.*

(ii) *$\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a finite union of uniformly separated sequences in $\mathbb{D}$.*

(iii) *There exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $h \in P_j\mathcal{H}$ we have*

$$\alpha(1 - |\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2 \;\le\; \sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, P_j f_i\rangle|^2 \;\le\; \beta(1 - |\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2. \tag{3.5}$$

(iv) *$\operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} + \ker C_E^* = \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$, where $E := ((1 - |\lambda_j|^2)^{-1/2} P_j f_i)_{j\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$.*

Remark 3.9. (a) The necessity of condition (i) for $\mathcal{A}$ to be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ was already proved in [5].

(b) Condition (iii) in Theorem 3.8 means that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the finite system $((1 - |\lambda_j|^2)^{-1/2} P_j f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a frame for $P_j\mathcal{H}$ with frame bounds α and β. Since the frame bounds are independent of $j \in \mathbb{N}$, condition (iii) is equivalent to saying that the system $E = ((1 - |\lambda_j|^2)^{-1/2} P_j f_i)_{j\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ with frame bounds α and β.

(c) Since E is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, the relation $\operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} + \ker C_E^* = \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$ in (iv) can be equivalently replaced by

$$C_E^* \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} = \mathcal{H}.$$

Indeed, assume that the first relation holds. As E is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ there exists $c \in \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$ such that $C_E^* c = h$. Now, $c = c_1 + c_2$ with $c_1 \in \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I}$ and $c_2 \in \ker C_E^*$. Hence, $h = C_E^* c_1 \in C_E^* \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I}$. Conversely, if $C_E^* \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} = \mathcal{H}$ and $c \in \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$, then $C_E^* c = C_E^* T_{\Lambda,I} h$ for some $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Thus, $c - T_{\Lambda,I} h \in \ker C_E^*$, i.e., $c \in \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} + \ker C_E^*$.

(d) If (ii) holds, then the range $\operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I}$ in (iv) is dense in $\ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$. Indeed, since (ii) means that the operator T_Λ is bounded and everywhere defined on $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ (cf. Theorem 2.10), the claim follows from Lemma 2.7.

(e) The condition (ii) of Theorem 3.8 cannot be strengthened by stating that $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly separated sequence itself. For a counterexample, let $m := |I|$ and let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a union of m uniformly separated subsequences Λ_i, $i = 1, \dots, m$, such that $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for $j \neq k$ and $\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda) = m$. Note that each Λ_i is necessarily infinite by Corollary 2.12. For $i = 1, \dots, m$ let $\Lambda_i = (\lambda_{j,i})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ and put $A_i := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{j,i}\langle \cdot, e_j\rangle e_j$, where $(e_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of a Hilbert space H. Choose vectors $g_1, \dots, g_m \in H$ such that $(A_i^n g_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a frame for H, $i = 1, \dots, m$. This is possible by Theorem 3.4. Now, put $\mathcal{H} := \bigoplus_{i=1}^m H$ and $A := \bigoplus_{i=1}^m A_i$, and let f_i be the vector in $\mathcal{H}$ with $(f_i)_i = g_i$ and $(f_i)_k = 0$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i\}$. Then $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, since for $h = h_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus h_m \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle h_i, A_i^n g_i\rangle|^2,$$

from where it is easily seen that the claim is true.

Proof of Theorem 3.8. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. By Theorem 3.1, the spectrum of A is contained in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $E(\mathbb{T}) = 0$. Moreover, Lemma 3.2 shows that the spectrum of A in $\mathbb{D}$ consists of infinitely many isolated eigenvalues with finite multiplicities. By Lemma 2.3, A is a diagonal operator. Let $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$ be its normal form as in (i). Then $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\dim P_j\mathcal{H} < \infty$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ be the frame bounds of $\mathcal{A}$. That is,

$$\alpha\|h\|^2 \;\leq\; \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle|^2 \;\leq\; \beta\|h\|^2, \qquad h \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{3.6}$$

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If $h \in P_j\mathcal{H}$, then $A^*h = \overline{\lambda_j}h$ and hence we have $|\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle| = |\langle (A^*)^n h, f_i\rangle| = |\lambda_j|^n |\langle h, f_i\rangle|$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, A^n f_i\rangle|^2 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{i\in I} |\lambda_j|^{2n} |\langle h, f_i\rangle|^2 = \frac{\sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, f_i\rangle|^2}{1 - |\lambda_j|^2}.$$

Together with (3.6), this proves (iii). From (iii) it follows that $(P_j f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a frame for the finite-dimensional space $P_j\mathcal{H}$. Thus, $|I| \geq \dim P_j\mathcal{H}$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, which is equivalent to $\operatorname{mult}(A) \leq |I|$. From (iii) we moreover conclude that

$$\sum_{i\in I} \|P_j f_i\|^2 \;\geq\; \alpha\varepsilon_j^2(\dim P_j\mathcal{H}) \;\geq\; \alpha\varepsilon_j^2 \tag{3.7}$$

for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where (cf. (3.3)) $\varepsilon_j := \sqrt{1 - |\lambda_j|^2}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. For this, simply choose an orthonormal basis of $P_j\mathcal{H}$ and plug its vectors into h in (3.5). Thus, for $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ we obtain for the evaluation operator T_Λ from (2.5) that

$$\|T_\Lambda\varphi\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j^2 |\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2 \;\leq\; \alpha^{-1} \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2 \|P_j f_i\|^2. \tag{3.8}$$

By Lemma 3.6, the latter expression is bounded from above by $C\|\varphi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})}^2$, where C is some positive constant. Thus, the operator T_Λ is everywhere defined and bounded. The claim (ii) now follows from Theorem 2.10. To prove (iv), we start by noting that $T_{\Lambda,I}$ is bounded as T_Λ is. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Then there exists $(c_{in})_{i\in I, n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(I \times \mathbb{N})$ such that

$h = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}A^n f_i$. Define $\varphi_i \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ by $\varphi_i(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}z^n$ for $i \in I$ and put $\phi := (\varphi_i)_{i\in I} \in H^2_I$. Then

$$h = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_j \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}A^n f_i = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}\lambda_j^n P_j f_i = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j\varphi_i(\lambda_j)(\varepsilon_j^{-1}P_j f_i),$$

and thus $h = C_E^*(T_\Lambda\varphi_i)_{i\in I} = C_E^* T_{\Lambda,I}\phi$. Hence, we have $C_E^* \operatorname{ran} T_{\Lambda,I} = \mathcal{H}$, which implies (iv), see Remark 3.9(b).

Conversely, let the conditions (i)–(iv) be satisfied. Let us first prove that for each $i \in I$ the system $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Bessel sequence. For this, fix $i \in I$ and deduce from (iii) that $\|P_j f_i\|^2 \le \beta\varepsilon_j^2$ holds for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that the evaluation operator T_Λ from (2.5) is everywhere defined and bounded by (ii) and Theorem 2.10. Thus, for every $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2\|P_j f_i\|^2 \le \beta\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\varepsilon_j\varphi(\lambda_j)|^2 = \beta\|T_\Lambda\varphi\|_2^2 \le \beta\|T_\Lambda\|^2\|\varphi\|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{D})}.$$

Hence, the condition (iii) in Lemma 3.6 is satisfied so that $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ indeed is a Bessel sequence. Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ be arbitrary. By (iv) (see also Remark 3.9(b)), there exists $\phi \in H^2_I$, $\phi = (\varphi_i)_{i\in I}$, such that $C_E^* T_{\Lambda,I}\phi = h$. For $i \in I$, let $(c_{in})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ such that $\varphi_i(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}z^n$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then

$$\sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}A^n f_i = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{in}\lambda_j^n P_j f_i = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_j\varphi_i(\lambda_j)(\varepsilon_j^{-1}P_j f_i) = h.$$

Hence, the synthesis operator of $\mathcal{A} = (A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is onto, which means that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. □

From Theorem 3.8 we deduce the following two corollaries.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\lambda_j P_j$ be a diagonal operator in normal form such that $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly separated and let $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ be a finite sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha(1-|\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2 \le \sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, f_i\rangle|^2 \le \beta(1-|\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},\, h \in P_j\mathcal{H}.$$

Proof. Since $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is assumed to be uniformly separated, the conditions (ii) and (iv) from Theorem 3.8 are satisfied (see Theorem 2.9). Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if condition (iii) from Theorem 3.8 holds. □

Corollary 3.11. *Assume that $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\lambda_j P_j$ is a diagonal operator in normal form and that $\dim P_j\mathcal{H} = |I| < \infty$ for all but a finite number of $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if the following two statements hold:*

(a) *$(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a uniformly separated sequence in $\mathbb{D}$.*
(b) *There exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $h \in P_j\mathcal{H}$ we have*

$$\alpha(1-|\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2 \le \sum_{i\in I} |\langle h, f_i\rangle|^2 \le \beta(1-|\lambda_j|^2)\|h\|^2.$$

Proof. If (a) and (b) hold, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ by Corollary 3.10. Conversely, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. Then (b) follows from Theorem 3.8. For the proof of (a) let us first assume that $\dim P_j\mathcal{H} = |I|$ for *all* $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(\varepsilon_j^{-1} P_j f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a frame for $P_j\mathcal{H}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with frame bounds α and β (see Remark 3.9), we conclude that it is even a Riesz basis of $P_j\mathcal{H}$ with Riesz bounds α and β. Hence, $E = (\varepsilon_j^{-1} P_j f_i)_{j\in\mathbb{N}, i\in I}$ is a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, the synthesis operator C_E^* is one-to-one, i.e., $\ker C_E^* = \{0\}$. Therefore, it is a consequence of Theorem 3.8 that $T_{\Lambda,I}$ is onto. By definition of $T_{\Lambda,I}$, also $T_\Lambda : H^2(\mathbb{D}) \to \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ is onto which is equivalent to $(\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ being uniformly separated (see Theorem 2.9).

For the general case, let $J := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \dim P_j\mathcal{H} = |I|\}$ and let $P := \sum_{j\in J} P_j$. Then $A_0 := A|P\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j\in J} \lambda_j (P_j|P\mathcal{H})$ and $(A_0^n P f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}, i\in I}$ is a frame for $P\mathcal{H}$. Thus, $(\lambda_j)_{j\in J}$ is uniformly separated by the first part of the proof. The claim now follows from Corollary 2.12. □

According to Theorem 3.8, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, the operator A is a diagonal operator, i.e., $A = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \lambda_j P_j$, and the sequence of its (distinct) eigenvalues $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a finite union of uniformly separated sequences. It is therefore natural to ask about the index $\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda)$ of Λ (see Definition 2.13), which is the minimum of those numbers n for which there exists a partition into uniformly separated subsequences $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ of Λ. Note that each separated subsequence of Λ is automatically uniformly separated by Theorem 2.11.

Theorem 3.12. *Let A be a diagonal operator, let $\Lambda = (\lambda_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of its distinct eigenvalues, and let $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ be a finite sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ with frame bounds α and β, then each pseudo-hyperbolic ball of radius $r < \sqrt{\alpha(8\beta|I|)^{-1}}$ contains at most $|I|$ elements of the sequence Λ. In particular, we have*

$$\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda) \le |I|. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. First of all, note that the "in particular"-claim follows from Lemma 2.14. Let $m := |I|$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that some ball $\mathbb{B}_r(z_0)$ contains $m+1$ elements of Λ, where $r < \sqrt{\alpha(8\beta|I|)^{-1}}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that these elements are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}$. Since ϱ is a metric on $\mathbb{D}$, we have $\varrho(\lambda_j, \lambda_k) < 2r$ for all $j, k = 1, \dots, m+1$.

Using the notation of Theorem 3.3, let $\vec{y}_j := \vec{y}_{j,1} = \varepsilon_j^{-1}(\langle e_{j,1}, f_i\rangle)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{C}^m$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\vec{y}_1, \dots, \vec{y}_{m+1}$ are $m+1$ vectors in $\mathbb{C}^m$, there exists some $c \in \mathbb{C}^{m+1}$ such that $\|c\|_2 = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} c_j \vec{y}_j = 0$. By Theorem 3.3, $(\vec{y}_j K_{\lambda_j})_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Riesz sequence with Riesz bounds α and β. In particular, we have $\|\vec{y}_j\|_2^2 \le \beta$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Using this, Cauchy-Schwarz, and Lemma 2.8, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &\le \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} c_j \vec{y}_j K_{\lambda_j} \right\|_{H_I^2}^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j \vec{y}_j \left(K_{\lambda_j} - K_{\lambda_{m+1}} \right) \right\|_{H_I^2}^2 \\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\| \vec{y}_j (K_{\lambda_j} - K_{\lambda_{m+1}}) \right\|_{H_I^2}^2 \le 2\beta \sum_{j=1}^{m} \varrho(\lambda_j, \lambda_{m+1})^2 \;\le\; 8\beta m r^2 < \alpha,
\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired contradiction. Here, we used that $\|\vec{y}\varphi\|_{H_I^2} = \|\vec{y}\|_2 \|\varphi\|_{H^2(\mathbb{D})}$ for $\vec{y} \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and $\varphi \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$, cf. (3.2). □

Remark 3.13. (a) As a consequence of Theorem 3.12, one can add the condition that $\mathrm{ind}(\Lambda) \leq |I|$ to condition (ii) in Theorem 3.8 without changing the statement of the theorem. If we do this, then Theorem 3.8 becomes a proper generalization of Theorem 3.4 because in the case $|I| = 1$ the new condition (ii) then states that Λ is uniformly seperated, so that condition (iv) is automatically satisfied.

(b) The estimate $\mathrm{ind}(\Lambda) \leq |I|$ from Theorem 3.12 is sharp in the sense that for every given finite index set I there exist a diagonal operator A and vectors f_i, $i \in I$, such that $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathrm{ind}(\Lambda) = |I|$ (where Λ is the sequence of the distinct eigenvalues of A). For an example, we refer the reader to Remark 3.9(e).

4. Dynamical Sampling with general bounded operators

In this section, we drop the requirement that $A \in L(\mathcal{H})$ be normal. Similarly as before, we shall fix $A \in L(\mathcal{H})$, an at most countable index set I, and vectors $f_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i \in I$, and define

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}(A, (f_i)_{i\in I}) := (A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}.$$

Recall that an operator $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *strongly stable* if $T^n f \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ holds for each $f \in \mathcal{H}$. In this case, it follows from the Banach-Steinhaus theorem that T is *power-bounded*, i.e., $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \|T^n\| < \infty$. Consequently, we infer from Gelfand's formula for the spectral radius that $r(T) = \sup\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(T)\} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|T^n\|^{1/n} \leq 1$. Hence, the spectrum of a strongly stable operator is contained in the closed unit disk. The following lemma was proved in [5] (see also (3.1)).

Lemma 4.1. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, then A^* is strongly stable. In particular, $\sigma(A) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.*

Corollary 4.2. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. Then neither A nor A^* has eigenvalues on $\mathbb{T}$. In particular,*

$$\sigma(A) \cap \mathbb{T} \subset \sigma_c(A) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma(A^*) \cap \mathbb{T} \subset \sigma_c(A^*). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Assume that $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ and $f \in \mathcal{H}$ are such that $A^* f = \lambda f$. Then $\|f\| = \|\lambda^n f\| = \|(A^*)^n f\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ by Lemma 4.1. Thus, $f = 0$. If $Af = \lambda f$, then

$$\|f\|^2 = |\langle \lambda^n f, f\rangle| = |\langle A^n f, f\rangle| = |\langle f, (A^*)^n f\rangle| \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. Again, $f = 0$ follows. The inclusions in (4.1) now simply follow from the fact that $\ker T^* = (\operatorname{ran} T)^\perp$ for $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$. □

The next proposition completes the necessary condition from Lemma 4.1 to a characterizing set of conditions.

Proposition 4.3. *The system $\mathcal{A} = (A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N},\, i\in I}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied.*

(i) *A^* is strongly stable.*
(ii) *$(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a Bessel sequence.*
(iii) *There exists a boundedly invertible positive selfadjoint operator $S \in L(\mathcal{H})$ such that*

$$ASA^* = S - F, \tag{4.2}$$

where F is the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$.

If the conditions (i)–(iii) *are satisfied, then the operator S in* (iii) *is necessarily the frame operator of $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ and let S be its frame operator. As a subsequence of the frame $\mathcal{A}$, $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a Bessel sequence. Furthermore, for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} ASA^*f &= \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\langle A^*f, A^n f_i\rangle A^{n+1}f_i = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\langle f, A^n f_i\rangle A^n f_i \\ &= \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\langle f, A^n f_i\rangle A^n f_i - \sum_{i\in I}\langle f, f_i\rangle f_i = Sf - Ff, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (4.2). For the converse statement, assume that (i)–(iii) are satisfied. From (iii) (and (ii)) we conclude that

$$A^2S(A^*)^2 = A(ASA^*)A^* = A(S-F)A^* = ASA^* - AFA^* = S - (F + AFA^*).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, we obtain by induction

$$A^nS(A^*)^n = S - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^kF(A^*)^k = S - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i\in I}\left\langle \cdot, A^k f_i\right\rangle A^k f_i.$$

Hence, for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\sum_{i\in I}\left|\left\langle f, A^k f_i\right\rangle\right|^2 = \langle Sf, f\rangle - \left\|S^{1/2}(A^*)^n f\right\|^2.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ and using (i), we conclude from the conditions on S in (iii) that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, if S_0 denotes the frame operator of $\mathcal{A}$, then $\langle (S-S_0)f, f\rangle = 0$ for $f \in \mathcal{H}$, which implies $S = S_0$. □

Although A itself might not be a contraction, the next proposition shows in particular that it is at least similar to a contraction.

Corollary 4.4. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ with frame operator S, then*

$$\left\|S^{-1/2}AS^{1/2}\right\| \leq 1.$$

Proof. Define $B := S^{-1/2}AS^{1/2}$. From $ASA^* = S - F$ (see (4.2)) we infer that $BB^* = \mathrm{Id} - F'$, where $F' = S^{-1/2}FS^{-1/2}$. Note that F' is a non-negative selfadjoint operator (since F is). Therefore, for $f \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\|B^*f\|^2 = \langle BB^*f, f\rangle = \|f\|^2 - \langle F'f, f\rangle \leq \|f\|^2,$$

which shows that $\|B\| \leq 1$. □

In what follows, we will mainly focus on the situation in which I is a finite index set – or at least the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is a compact operator. In this case, it is clear that $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ itself cannot be a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ unless $\dim\mathcal{H} < \infty$. The next proposition is key to most of our observations below. Recall that an operator $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be *finite-dimensional* or of *finite-rank* if $\dim \operatorname{ran} T < \infty$.

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. If the frame operator F of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is compact, then for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ the operator $A^* - \lambda$ is upper semi-Fredholm. If $|I|$ is finite (in which case F is even finite-dimensional), then*

$$\operatorname{nul}(A^* - \lambda) \le |I|, \qquad \lambda \in \mathbb{D}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. We derive the claim from the identity (4.2). For $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ we have

$$AS(A^* - \lambda) = ASA^* - \lambda AS = S - F - \lambda AS = (\mathrm{Id} - \lambda A)S - F.$$

For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ the operator $B_\lambda := \mathrm{Id} - \lambda A$ is boundedly invertible. This is clear for $\lambda = 0$, and for $\lambda \neq 0$ we have $B_\lambda = \lambda(\lambda^{-1} - A)$, which is boundedly invertible as $\sigma(A) \subset \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Thus,

$$B_\lambda^{-1} AS(A^* - \lambda) = S - B_\lambda^{-1} F. \tag{4.4}$$

By Theorem 2.4, the operator on the right hand side is Fredholm, and so $A^* - \lambda$ is upper semi-Fredholm by Lemma 2.5.

Now, let $|I|$ be finite and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ be an eigenvalue of A^*. If f is a corresponding eigenvector, then (4.4) yields $f = S^{-1}B_\lambda^{-1}Ff$. Hence, $\ker(A^* - \lambda) \subset S^{-1}B_\lambda^{-1} \operatorname{ran} F$, which implies (4.3) as $\dim \operatorname{ran} F \le |I|$. □

In the proof of the next theorem we heavily make use of the punctured neighborhood theorem, Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 4.6. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$ and the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is compact, then* $\operatorname{ind}(A^* - \lambda) = \operatorname{ind}(A^*)$ *for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ and exactly one of the following cases holds:*

- **(i)** *$\sigma(A^*) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\sigma_p(A^*) = \mathbb{D}$.*
- **(ii)** *$\sigma(A^*) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\sigma_p(A^*)$ is discrete in $\mathbb{D}$.*
- **(iii)** *$\sigma(A^*)$ is discrete in $\mathbb{D}$.*

In the case **(i)**, *each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ is an eigenvalue of A^* with infinite algebraic multiplicity, whereas in the cases* **(ii)** *and* **(iii)** *the eigenvalues of A^* in $\mathbb{D}$ have finite algebraic multiplicities. If case* **(iii)** *holds, then we have* $\operatorname{ind}(A^*) = 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, $A^* - \lambda$ is upper semi-Fredholm for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Hence it follows from the punctured neighborhood theorem, Theorem 2.6, and a compactness argument that $\operatorname{ind}(A^* - \lambda)$ is constant on $\mathbb{D}$. Similarly, one sees that $\operatorname{nul}(A^* - \lambda)$ is constant on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \Delta$, where Δ is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{D}$. Denote this constant value by n_0. Then it is immediate that case **(i)** is satisfied exactly if $n_0 > 0$. If $n_0 = 0$, then case **(iii)** occurs if and only if $\operatorname{ind}(A^*) = 0$.

Let $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ be an eigenvalue of A^*. For $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$ close to λ_0 we have $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Delta$ and hence $n_0 = \operatorname{nul}(A^* - \lambda) = \operatorname{nul}(A^* - \lambda_0) - k$, where (see Theorem 2.6)

$$k = \dim\big(\ker(A^* - \lambda_0)/\left(\ker(A^* - \lambda_0) \cap R_\infty(A^* - \lambda_0)\right)\big).$$

Hence, cases **(ii)** and **(iii)** occur exactly when $\operatorname{nul}(A^* - \lambda_0) = k$. This happens if and only if $\ker(A^* - \lambda_0) \cap R_\infty(A^* - \lambda_0) = \{0\}$. But the latter means that the algebraic multiplicity of λ_0 as an eigenvalue of A^* is finite. □

The next corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.6.

Corollary 4.7. *If $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$, $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, and the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is compact, then $r(A) = 1$. In particular, $\|A^n\| \not\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Corollary 4.8. *If* $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$, $\mathcal{A}$ *is a frame for* $\mathcal{H}$ *with frame operator* S, *and the frame operator of* $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ *is compact, then*

$$\left\|S^{-1/2}AS^{1/2}\right\| = 1.$$

Proof. By Corollary 4.4, $B := S^{-1/2}AS^{1/2}$ is a contraction. Since B is similar to A, we have $\sigma(B) = \sigma(A)$ and therefore, by Corollary 4.7, $1 = r(A) = r(B) \leq \|B\| \leq 1$. □

We define the *essential spectrum* $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T)$ of $T \in L(\mathcal{H})$ by those $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which $T - \lambda$ is not semi-Fredholm.

Corollary 4.9. *Assume that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a frame for* $\mathcal{H}$ *and the frame operator of* $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ *is compact. Then*

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(A^*) = \sigma_c(A^*) = \sigma(A^*) \cap \mathbb{T}.$$

If, in addition, $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) \neq 0$, *then*

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(A^*) = \sigma_c(A^*) = \mathbb{T}.$$

Proof. $\sigma_c(A^*) \subset \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(A^*)$ holds by definition and $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(A^*) \subset \sigma(A^*) \cap \mathbb{T}$ is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.5. The remaining inclusion $\sigma(A^*) \cap \mathbb{T} \subset \sigma_c(A^*)$ holds due to Corollary 4.2. If $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) \neq 0$, then either case **(i)** or case **(ii)** holds. In these cases, we have $\sigma(A^*) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and hence, clearly, $\sigma(A^*) \cap \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}$. □

In the proof of Theorem 4.6 we have not used that the operator A^* is strongly stable. We incorporate this in the proof of the next theorem, where we make use of a theorem from [19].

Theorem 4.10. *Let* I *be finite and assume that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a frame for* $\mathcal{H}$. *Then* $\mathrm{def}(A^* - \lambda) = 0$ *for all* $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \Delta$, *where* $\Delta \subset \mathbb{D}$ *is discrete in* $\mathbb{D}$. *In particular, either case* **(i)** *or case* **(iii)** *occurs. Case* **(iii)** *holds if and only if* $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) = 0$. *In this case, also* A *is strongly stable.*

Proof. Let S and F be the frame operators of $\mathcal{A}$ and $(f_i)_{i\in I}$, respectively, and define $T := S^{1/2}A^*S^{-1/2}$. By Corollary 4.4, the operator T is a contraction. Moreover, also T is strongly stable and $T^*T = \mathrm{Id} - F_1$, where $F_1 = S^{-1/2}FS^{-1/2}$. Since T and A^* are similar, it suffices to prove the corresponding statements for the operator T.

Let us show the first part of the theorem. To this end, we shall use techniques from the proof of [20, Lemma 1.3]. The key in this proof is a triangulation of the contraction T of the form (see [14, Theorem II.4.1])

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{01} & C \\ 0 & T_{00} \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to a decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{01} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{00}$. Here, $T_{01} \in C_{01}$ (that is, $\inf\{\|(T_{01}^*)^n f\| : n \in \mathbb{N}\} > 0$ for each $f \in \mathcal{H}_{01} \setminus \{0\}$) and $T_{00} \in C_{00}$ (i.e., both T_{00} and T_{00}^* are strongly stable). We have

$$\mathrm{Id} - T^*T = \mathrm{Id} - \begin{pmatrix} T_{01}^* & 0 \\ C^* & T_{00}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} T_{01} & C \\ 0 & T_{00} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id} - T_{01}^*T_{01} & -T_{01}^*C \\ -C^*T_{01} & \mathrm{Id} - C^*C - T_{00}^*T_{00} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, all entries in the latter operator matrix are of finite rank. In particular, T_{01} is upper semi-Fredholm (see Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 2.5). Since $T_{01} \in C_{01}$, the operator

T_{01}^* is injective and thus it has a bounded left-inverse. Hence, as $T_{01}^* C$ is of finite rank we infer that also C is of finite rank. Thus, $\mathrm{Id} - T_{00}^* T_{00}$ is of finite rank. Since $T_{00} \in C_{00}$, this yields that T_{00} is a so-called C_0-contraction (see [19]). Consequently, the spectrum of T_{00} in $\mathbb{D}$ is discrete (cf. [14, Theorem III.5.1]).

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \backslash \sigma(T_{00})$. Then $(T^* - \overline{\lambda})f = 0$ implies $(T_{01}^* - \overline{\lambda})g = 0$ and $C^* g + (T_{00}^* - \overline{\lambda})h = 0$, where $f = g + h$, $g \in \mathcal{H}_{01}$, $h \in \mathcal{H}_{00}$. But as $T_{01}^* - \overline{\lambda}$ is injective (due to $T_{01} \in C_{01}$), we conclude that $g = 0$ and therefore also $h = 0$ as $\overline{\lambda} \in \rho(T_{00}^*)$. Hence, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \sigma(T_{00})$ we have that $\mathrm{def}(T - \lambda) = \mathrm{nul}(T^* - \overline{\lambda}) = 0$. This also implies that case **(ii)** cannot occur and that case **(iii)** holds if and only if $\mathrm{ind}(T) = 0$.

Assume that $\mathrm{ind}(T) = 0$. In order to show that also T^* is strongly stable, due to [19, Theorem 2] it suffices to prove that $\mathrm{Id} - TT^*$ is of finite rank. To see this, we observe that there exists a representation $T = U|T|$ of T, where $|T| = (T^*T)^{1/2}$ and U is a unitary operator in $\mathcal{H}$, see [8, Lemma 2.9]. We have $F_1 = \mathrm{Id} - T^*T = \mathrm{Id} - |T|^2$ and thus $|T| = \mathrm{Id} - F_1(\mathrm{Id} + |T|)^{-1}$. Therefore, $T = U|T| = U - F_2$ with some finite rank operator F_2, and consequently

$$TT^* = \mathrm{Id} - [F_2 U^* + (U - F_2)F_2^*]\,.$$

Thus, $\mathrm{Id} - TT^*$ is of finite rank. □

Remark 4.11. It follows from the proof of Theorem 4.10 and the references used therein that the claim of the theorem remains to hold if we replace the condition that I be finite by the requirement that the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ is of trace class.

The following example shows that case **(i)** in Theorem 4.6 cannot be neglected as a possibility for an operator generating a frame.

Example 4.12. Let $\mathcal{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and let A be the right-shift, i.e., $(Af)(0) = 0$ and $(Af)(j) = f(j-1)$ for $j \geq 1$, $f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Moreover, let $f_0 \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ be defined by $f_0(j) = \delta_{j,0}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, f_0 is the first standard unit vector. It is easy to see that $(A^n f_0)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the standard ONB of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ and therefore a frame for $\mathcal{H}$. The left-shift A^* is surjective and has a one-dimensional kernel. In fact, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ the operator $A^* - \lambda$ has this property. Hence, every $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ is an eigenvalue of A^*. The algebraic multiplicity of each $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ is infinite since $\mathrm{ran}(A^* - \lambda) = \mathcal{H}$.

Recall that a semigroup of operators is a collection $(T_t)_{t\geq 0} \subset L(\mathcal{H})$ satisfying $T_{s+t} = T_s T_t$ for all $s, t \in [0, \infty)$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let $A^* = T_{t_0}$, $t_0 > 0$, be an instance of a semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of operators and let the frame operator of $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ be compact. Then if $\mathcal{A}$ is a frame for $\mathcal{H}$, either case* **(ii)** *or case* **(iii)** *occurs. In case* **(ii)** *we have* $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) = -\infty$.

Proof. Let $B_m := T_{t_0/m}^*$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 1$. Then we have $B_m^m = A$ for each m. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ be arbitrary. Then $A^* - \lambda^m = (B_m^*)^m - \lambda^m = P(B_m^*, \lambda)(B_m^* - \lambda)$, where $P(B_m^*, \lambda)$ is a polynomial in B_m^* and λ. This and Lemma 2.5 imply that $B_m^* - \lambda$ is upper semi-Fredholm. Moreover, by the index formula (2.4) we have that $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) = m \cdot \mathrm{ind}(B_m^*)$. In particular, $\mathrm{ind}(A^*)$ is divisible by each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \geq 2$. Thus, $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) \in \{0, -\infty\}$. Note that $\mathrm{ind}(A^*) = +\infty$ is not possible since $\mathrm{nul}(A^*) < \infty$.

Now, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$, $\lambda = re^{it}$, $r \in (0,1)$, $t \in [0, 2\pi)$, let $n = \mathrm{nul}(A^* - \lambda) + 1$, and put $\lambda_k := \sqrt[n]{r} \exp(\frac{i}{n}(t + 2k\pi))$, $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$. Suppose that each λ_k is an eigenvalue of B_n^*

with eigenvector g_k, $k = 0, \dots, n-1$. Then each g_k is an eigenvector of A^* with respect to λ as $A^* g_k = (B_n^*)^n g_k = \lambda_k^n g_k = \lambda g_k$. But as the g_k are linearly independent, this is a contradiction to the choice of n. Thus, the eigenvalues of B_n^* do not fill the open unit disk. In turn, $\sigma_p(B_n^*)$ is discrete in $\mathbb{D}$ and hence the same holds for $\sigma_p(A^*)$. □

Note that we have not used any continuity properties of the semigroup in the proof above. In fact, if $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup, it can be shown that under the conditions of Proposition 4.13, $\ker(T_t) = \{0\}$ for each $t \geq 0$, which in particular excludes case **(i)**.

Theorem 4.14. *Let I be finite. In order that $\mathcal{A}$ be a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$ it is necessary that A^* satisfies case* **(i)**.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, define the two closed subspaces

$$M_{n,-} := \operatorname{span}\left\{A^k f_i : i \in I,\, 0 \leq k < n\right\},$$
$$M_{n,+} := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\left\{A^k f_i : i \in I,\, k \geq n\right\}.$$

As $\mathcal{A}$ is a Riesz basis, we have that

$$M_{n,-} \dotplus M_{n,+} = \mathcal{H}.$$

Since

$$f \in M_{n,+}^{\perp} \iff \langle f, A^{n+k} f_i\rangle = 0 \;\forall k \geq 0,\, i \in I \iff (A^*)^n f = 0,$$

we conclude that $M_{n,+}^{\perp} = \ker((A^*)^n)$. Hence, we have

$$\dim \ker((A^*)^n) = \dim M_{n,+}^{\perp} = \operatorname{codim} M_{n,+} = \dim M_{n,-} = n|I|.$$

Consequently, the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue $\lambda = 0$ of A^* is infinite. By Theorem 4.6 this only happens if case **(i)** is satisfied. □

Proposition 4.13 and Theorem 4.14 immediately yield the following corollary.

Corollary 4.15. *Let $A^* = T_{t_0}$, $t_0 > 0$, be an instance of a semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of operators. Then, for any finite sequence $(f_i)_{i\in I}$ of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$, the system $(A^n f_i)_{n\in\mathbb{N}, i\in I}$ is never a Riesz basis of $\mathcal{H}$.*

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank D. Suárez for sharing his knowledge on sequences in the unit disk.

References

[1] A. Aldroubi, R. Aceska, J. Davis, and A. Petrosyan, Dynamical sampling in shift-invariant spaces, Contemp. Math. of the AMS 603 (2013), 139–148.
[2] A. Aldroubi, C. Cabrelli, A.F. Çakmak, U. Molter, and A. Petrosyan, Iterative actions of normal operators, J. Funct. Anal. 272 (2017), 1121–1146.
[3] A. Aldroubi, C. Cabrelli, U. Molter, and S. Tang, Dynamical sampling, to appear in Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.
[4] A. Aldroubi, J. Davis, and I. Krishtal, Dynamical Sampling: Time Space Trade-off, Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal. 34 (2013), 495–503.

[5] A. Aldroubi and A. Petrosyan, Dynamical sampling and systems from iterative actions of operators, Preprint.
[6] O. Christensen, An introduction to frames and Riesz bases, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, 2003.
[7] J.B. Conway, A course in functional analysis, 2nd edition, Springer, New York, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990.
[8] R. Duong and F. Philipp, The effect of perturbations of linear operators on their polar decomposition, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2017), 779–790.
[9] P. Duren and A.P. Schuster, Finite unions of interpolating sequences, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 130 (2002), 2609–2615.
[10] M.A. Kaashoek, Stability theorems for closed linear operators, Indag. Math. 27 (1965), 452–466.
[11] T. Kato, Perturbation theory for linear operators, 2nd Edition, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1980.
[12] Y. Lu and M. Vetterli, Spatial super-resolution of a diffusion field by temporal oversampling in sensor networks, In: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2009. IEEE International Conference on ICASSP 2009, April 2009, pp. 2249–2252.
[13] V. Müller, Spectral theory of linear operators and spectral systems in Banach algebras, 2nd ed., Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, 2007.
[14] B. Sz.-Nagy, C. Foiaş, H. Bercovici, L. Kérchy, Harmonic analysis of operators on Hilbert space, Springer, 2010.
[15] F. Philipp, Bessel orbits of normal operators, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 448 (2017), 767–785.
[16] J. Ranieri, A. Chebira, Y.M. Lu, M. Vetterli, Sampling and reconstructing diffusion fields with localized sources, In: IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2011, May 2011, pp. 4016–4019.
[17] W. Rudin, Real and complex analysis, third edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1987.
[18] H.S. Shapiro and A.L. Shields, On some interpolation problems for analytic functions, Amer. J. Math. 83 (1961), 513–532.
[19] K. Takahashi and M. Uchiyama, Every C_{00} contraction with Hilbert-Schmidt defect operator is of class C_0, J. Operator Theory 10 (1983), 331–335.
[20] M. Uchiyama, Contractions with (σ, c) defect operators, J. Operator Theory 12 (1984), 221–233.
[21] M. Unser, Sampling – 50 years after Shannon, Proc. IEEE 88 (2000), 569–587.

(C. Cabrelli, U. Molter and V. Paternostro) Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Departamento de Matemática, Buenos Aires, Argentina, and CONICET-Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Investigaciones Matemáticas Luis A. Santalo (IMAS), Buenos Aires, Argentina

E-mail address, C. Cabrelli: cabrelli@dm.uba.ar
URL, C. Cabrelli: http://mate.dm.uba.ar/~cabrelli/
E-mail address, U. Molter: umolter@dm.uba.ar
URL, U. Molter: http://mate.dm.uba.ar/~umolter/
E-mail address, V. Paternostro: vpater@dm.uba.ar

(F. Philipp) Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Departamento de Matemática, Buenos Aires, Argentina

E-mail address, F. Philipp: fmphilipp@dm.uba.ar
URL, F. Philipp: http://cms.dm.uba.ar/members/fmphilipp/